2059

Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER — PROUDHON

Vol. XI.—No. 7. NEW YORK, N. Y., AUGUST 10, 1895. Whole No. 319.

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."
JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

The New York "Home Journal" of August 7 contains a three-column editorial defence of the abolition of "justification" in type-setting introduced by Liberty more than a year ago. Those interested to read it can secure a copy by mailing five cents in stamps to the "Home Journal," 231 Broadway, New York City. Slowly, but surely, this reform will make its way.

The most important use of gold, according to the "Evening Post," is "the support that it gives to credit." Whose credit is supported by gold? Not the merchant's or landlord's or manufacturer's. None of these has any gold reserve to support his credit. Does gold support the banker's credit? If so, what becomes of the support in times of panic? Whenever curiosity or suspicion or any other motive impels people to *test* the value of this alleged prop, it is found to be wholly imaginary, the system that is said to be supported collapsing utterly. What would be the value of a bridge that could not be put to actual use without grave danger?

In the personal controversy between Mr. Kitson and Mr. Whittick that has grown out of the standard-of-value discussion I take no part. In fact, I wish it to be understood that, although I have found it necessary to speak in contemptuous terms of the no-standard theory, it has not been my intention to denounce my opponents in bitterness of spirit. Mr. Whittick especially is a valued friend of mine; I regard him as one of the best of men, and in most matters a very sensible man. Personal acquaintance with Mr. Kitson and Mr. Ward is not my privilege, but I have no reason to doubt that they are worthy of similar commendation. If I have used strong language concerning their financial heresies, it is because I wish to leave the public mind in no manner of doubt as to the distinctness of my separation from them on the standard-of-value question. I am well aware that it is no argument to brand a proposition as a piece of lunacy, but it is an effective way of making people understand that one not only does not accept the proposition, but considers it too irrational to be entertained for a moment.

When I said in a previous issue that now Mr. Kitson is an almost deserted man, I meant that his Anarchist adherents are very few. Certainly I had no intention of claiming that the thousands of governmentalists who were no-standard men before Mr. Kitson was ever heard of had been stripped of their delusion. Of the men whom he mentions in another column as sharing his view only one is an Anarchist,—Mr. John F. Kelly. And regarding Mr. Kelly I make bold to say that, whenever that gentleman shall see fit to emerge from the retirement which he has maintained these many years, and shall announce in explicit terms his views regarding the necessity of a standard of value, it will be found that, however enthusiastic the general terms in which he may have endorsed Mr. Kitson's book, he really believes in the necessity of a *material* unit of value as thoroughly as I do, and utterly rejects the idea of an *invariable* unit of value. The unqualified approval which he has given to Mr. Kitson is simply one of the most hasty of "bad breaks," which he will never be able to defend for a moment after he has made it possible for me or any other critic to place his views in contrast with those propositions in Mr. Kitson's book which its author has acknowledged as central in his theory. Mr. Kitson can claim Mr. Kelly as an ally only as long as Mr. Kelly shall remain in the shadow. As to his other Anarchist adherents, I doubt very much whether ten plumb-line Anarchists, known as such among the comrades, can be found in the whole country who will declare their disbelief in a standard of value.

A writer who seems to have been on friendly terms with the late Professor Huxley says that in his last years Huxley often spoke of the futility of individual efforts against the power of conservatism, and of the dead weight of stolid ignorance, the influence of personal interest, and the female instinct of subordination as potent allies of superstition. Huxley's own career shows that individual efforts, far from being futile, sometimes achieve wonderful results. The potent allies of superstition have received some very crushing blows during Huxley's lifetime, and he himself nearly demoralized them. The allies of superstition are not as potent as they seem. They surrender entrenchment after entrenchment, fortress after fortress, without realizing their defeats. Their policy is one of retreat and flight, but they never *admit* that they have lost ground. But they do lose it, and it falls into the power of the Huxleys and other aggressive fighters of the "potent allies." Since Huxley's death I have greatly enjoyed reading the estimates of his personality and work published in the religious newspapers. What do I find? Only the Catholic and a few of the smaller Protestant newspapers venture to speak disparagingly of him. All the important and influential papers add a few lines of perfunctory and half-hearted criticism to columns of high praise and laudation. Of their most aggressive and brilliant enemy they lack the courage and wit to say something emphatically adverse. Even of the dead lion they seem to be afraid, so vivid is their impression of his might and their own abject helplessness in his presence. No, no, individual efforts are not futile, and conservatism is not impregnable. Unlike the Bourbons, conservatism, learning very little, forgets very easily. Today it refuses to recognize its position of yesterday, and, if you destroy its most sacred belief, it will at once turn to some new idol and worship it as blindly as the old. That propensity, however, does not diminish the glory of your victories.

The London "Bimetallist" publishes in full the interesting discussion on the subject of bimetallism recently held at the London Institution. The leading speakers were all distinguished men,—bankers, prominent members of parliament, and so on. A careful reading of the long report shows that the debaters failed to agree on any point except one. They differed on the question whether industry is depressed, whether gold has appreciated or depreciated, whether bimetallism means one standard or two, whether standards affect prices or not, whether there is a scarcity of gold or not, whether a gold standard is possible for the world at large or not, etc. The point on which there was curious unanimity was this: the first speaker supported his bimetallic argument by the findings of a committee of the house of commons to the effect that an industrial depression existed in all gold countries and that the cause "would probably be found in currency disturbance." Mr. Currie, the great banker, in his reply, provoked great laughter by saying about this report: "Having had some experience of the resolutions of that honorable house, I am bold enough to say that I do not view them with any great respect, nor am I strongly impressed with their authority, but the history of this particular resolution must be known to many who are now present. . . . I suspect that this resolution was allowed to pass unchallenged as a tactical move in order to conciliate some agricultural supporter of the government or some Lancashire member with a doubtful seat." Not one of the speakers who followed Mr. Currie ventured to defend the report of the house of commons, while one of them parenthetically remarked, with the approval of the gathering, that the house of commons seemed to be "rather at a discount here." The first thing knowing people do in attempting to deal with important questions is to brush aside all *political* contributions to the matter as so much rubbish. Is this the way to treat our august legislators and rulers? Such contempt is fatal to their authority and influence.

Liberty.

Issued Fortnightly at Two Dollars a Year; Single Copies, Eight Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Editor and Publisher.

Office of Publication, 24 Gold Street.
Post Office Address: Liberty, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., AUGUST 10, 1895.

"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the excise man, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel."—Proudhon.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Law versus Justice.

It appears from the comments of the legal journals that the question in regard to the province of the jury in criminal cases was only recently settled by the supreme court of the United States. In the decision in the case of Sparf vs. the government, it was laid down, as the law of the land, that the jury judges of facts alone, the judge declaring the law. Two or three judges, it is stated, strenuously fought this doctrine and adhered to the view that the jury is entitled to judge of the law as well, but I have not seen their opinions and do not know what arguments they used in support of their contention. The opinion of the court, written by Judge Harlan, attempts to show that both precedent and principle are opposed to the idea that the jury may disregard judge-declared law and become a law unto itself. Arguing in favor of his own view, Judge Harlan, among other things, says:

> Under any other system the courts, although established in order to declare the law, would for every practical purpose be eliminated from our system of government as instrumentalities devised for the protection equally of society and of individuals in their essential rights. When that occurs, our government will cease to be a government of laws, and become a government of men. Liberty regulated by law is the underlying principle of our institutions.

Such an argument is calculated to impress many superficial people, to whom a "government of men" sounds rather ominously, reminding them of tyranny of monarchies or oligarchies. As a matter of fact, however, the alleged argument is merely a catch-phrase, which hides a fundamental misconception. In the first place, there are at the present day several American States in which "government of men" exists instead of government of law, and neither their own citizens or the citizens of other States have ever held that sort of government in any way inferior to the government of laws championed by Judge Harlan. Whether those States realize that they are "mere" governments of men is immaterial; the point is that, under the definition, they *are* such, and that, notwithstanding this condition, their administration of justice compares very favorably with that of the States enjoying Judge Harlan's kind of government. To the average man an ounce of fact is of more value than any amount of abstract reasoning, and the phrase "government of men" will cease to worry them as soon as they discover that Illinois, Maryland, and some other States actually permit the jury to be a law unto itself and to disregard the judge's instructions as to the law of the case.

Those, on the other hand, who are in the habit of analyzing propositions will ask themselves whether the government of men which results from investing juries with the power of judging of the law is the same *kind* of government of men as that which they have learned to distrust and abhor. Government of men is objectionable when it is the government of *some* men; and to escape the capricious tyranny of individuals, or classes, so-called government of law, being fixed, certain, and definite, is naturally resorted to. As long as these attributes of certainty and fixity are preserved, the preference is justified. But suppose government of law becomes fully as uncertain as government of men, owing to judicial usurpations? Then the distinction disappears, and the people are confronted with the original question as to what kind of government is least oppressive. Now, the system of trial by jury is a device to escape, not only the old and tyrannical form of government of a few men, but the newer tyranny of alleged government of laws twisted and strained by a few men to suit supposed necessities of the time. While it was *a* form of government of men, it was the best possible form, and was adopted because it promised to operate more justly than any other form of government, whether of men or of law. For what was the essential principle of the system? That not the government's fiat, or the laws of its own making, interpreted by its own servants, should determine the rights and liabilities of citizens, but juries selected from the entire mass of subjects, free from the governmental bias and bound to do justice from self-interest as well as from social considerations. Trial by jury did not abolish government, but it was a great improvement upon the forms of government which preceded it, because it was supposed to represent, as thoroughly as possible, the common sense and sentiments of the whole people rather than of a narrow class. Historical experience abundantly confirms this view of the jury system. Where the jury is really the government, the individual enjoys greater freedom and secures more complete justice than under any other form of government. It is only where the jury's most valuable prerogatives have been abolished and the system has been emasculated and impaired that it has proved a failure as a palladium of liberty and justice.

Now, Judge Harlan's fallacy consists in this: that he gives as his reason for emasculating trial by jury—for stripping it of the very function which constituted it *an improvement* on other forms of government—the indisputable and conceded fact that genuine trial by jury is one of the forms of "governments of men," thus implying (what is not true) that it is inferior to government of law and a reversion to a less perfect type. Instead of being a reversion, it is a development, a progressive advance. It is better than the government of law which it supplanted, because it is fairer and more just. Relatively speaking, it may be described as a government of justice. The community does not want "law", it is interested in securing justice, and trial by juries that are a law unto themselves is the best means toward realizing that end.

It should be added that Judge Harlan's argument is deemed by legal authorities the most conclusive that has been advanced in opposition to the doctrine that juries are judges of law as well as of fact. We have seen its flaws and fallacies, and are entitled to conclude that there is really nothing substantial to be urged in favor of the present view of the jury's function. In this connection it is a pleasure to reproduce the following editorial from the Richmond "Times," written *à propos* of a recent decision of the Virginia court of appeals depriving the jury of the right to pass upon the law:

> We will frankly admit that we did not know of this decision, but we should have unhesitatingly stated that it is part of the common law of Virginia that a jury is judge of the law and the facts in a criminal cause, even if we had known of this decision, and in spite of it.
>
> We care not what any court may decide; we shall always claim that the proposition is the very essence of the jury system, as our Anglo-Saxon ancestors raised it up and handed it down to us. We look on the jury system in criminal causes as the palladium of our liberties, and that foundation-rock upon which the noblest virtues of our race are built; and we look upon the essential principle of the jury system, from which all its energies emanate, to be the proposition that, no matter what crime a citizen may stand accused of, and no matter how clear and convincing the evidence of the charge against him may be, yet that citizen is not to be harmed to the extent of one hair of his head unless twelve of his neighbors, who know all the ins and outs of the matter, and the true inspiration of the act, shall unanimously agree that he is to be punished. We take this, not from decisions of courts nor the dicta of judges, however able, pure, or learned, but from the history of our race and the philosophy of our institutions.

V. Y.

Sham from the Ground Up.

At the meeting of the council of the National Educational Association in Denver, Earl Barnes, of Stanford University, said: "A knowledge of Christian theology is absolutely essential to an understanding of our art, our literature. . . as well as that which gives purpose to the world." He asked whether "the natural tendency in children did not make them liars, Communists, and Anarchists." The Stanford University is the most gigantic monument to humbug that even this age of humbug has produced. It was built with Pacific Railroad money, the getting of which from the government constitutes one of the most stupendous frauds of modern times. It is a memorial to Senator Stanford's son, who died during boyhood, and whom preacher Newman compared to all the celebrities in the calendar, from Jesus Christ to Michael Angelo. It stands, therefore, for about as much sham and hypocrisy as we can find in a day's search. It is not strange, then, that its representative should carry out its cherished traditions by grouping children, liars, and Anarchists together.

The belief in Christianity which enables us to understand art and literature, and the purpose of the world, in the Stanfordian sense, means the art of money-grubbing. But the teachers at the Stanford University cannot hope to so instruct the students that they will be able to follow in the footsteps of its founder. Rich as

Uncle Sam is, in his power to rob, he cannot give the students fifteen million dollars each, as he did Stanford. C.

An American Academy.

Some months ago a rumor went the rounds of the papers that an American Academy was to be started, on the same plan as the French Academy. It struck us at the time as an excellent idea, and we wonder that it was not thought of before; we certainly have the *raw material* for more than forty immortals,—many more.

On hearing the rumor, we immediately put ourselves in communication with the great Mahatma, Hoky Poky, who at our request examined everything connected with the proposed academy in its astral form. He assures us that it will be established, and sends not alone the names of the first fillers of the *fauteuils*, but also the books which gained their admission.

Here is the list:

CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW.
"The Stomach's Power over Thought."

C. A. DANA.
"Eating Crow as a Fine Art:
A personal reminiscence."

JOHN WANAMAKER.
"The Bargain-Counter, or, The Special Sale.
A thrilling romance of Market Street."

WARD MCALLISTER.*
"Cooking a Ham:
A gastronomic idyll."

CARDINAL GIBBONS.
"Scientific Proof of the Immaculate Conception, or,
How the Exception Proved the Rule."

EDWARD ATKINSON.
"The Slop-Barrel as a Factor in Political Economy, or,
How to Live on Five Cents a Day."

T. DEWITT TALMAGE.
"How the Meek can Live on $20,000 a Year."

R. T. ELY.
"The Gas Question:
Proof that college professors can furnish gas even
cheaper than municipalities."

Further than the above our Mahatma cannot see clearly at present, but he thinks the Cowboy Rhymer, who has recently been appointed Poet-Lariat of Colorado, stands a good show, and the man who translated "Trilby" into French is not far behind in the race.

We will back Hoky Poky against all the spook contributors of the "Arena" and give odds. C.

The Land of the Altruists.

If you start from the South Pole and sail due north, you will come to a wonderful country inhabited by the people called Altruists.

They are called so because they prefer other people's happiness to their own.

They are a very industrious, hard-working, uncomplaining people, forever toiling from daylight to dark, making all kinds of useful and luxurious things; yet so unwilling are they to enjoy the fruits of their labor, so anxious for somebody else to be happy at their expense, that they have made this very ingenious and complete arrangement to secure that result.

They have ordained that everybody who has produced a thousand dollars' worth of goods shall receive from the rest of the community sixty dollars a year; he who has made or obtained in any way ten thousand dollars' worth shall receive six hundred dollars a year; and so on in proportion.

Now, it is easily seen that, as the people to whom these stipends are paid are at liberty to go on working and making enough to live on, they are able to lay by the amounts paid to them by the community. After awhile these amounts become so large that they need not work at all, for all the rest of the Altruist community are pledged to support them, their children, grandchildren, and greatgrandchildren, not only till death, but forever.

Such sweet and unselfish dispositions have these Altruists.

There are getting to be a good many now of these people who are supported by the Altruists.

Two or three million at a guess in every twenty or thirty million families do not work, but are paid because they have so much already. They are getting very bossy, too, these stipendiaries of the workers, and begin to hold themselves very loftily, and despise the unselfish workers as dirty, ignorant, low creatures, unmindful of the fact that it is only because the workers are Altruists that they enjoy providing luxuries for others rather than for themselves.

It is getting to be rather hard scratching, too, for the workers, Altruists though they be, who enjoy hunger and suffering; for to the objects of their care the supported class, they have given, not only all the houses and furniture, and all but a little of the butter and meat and bread, but the very land itself, so that now, when the Altruist workers want to work still harder and to cultivate more land to support the rapidly-growing numbers of the Aristocrats, they find themselves forbidden by these very Aristocrats to use the land which they have given them.

Clearly a catastrophe must occur. Although the Altruists enjoy starving as long as they have the pleasure of seeing the Aristocrats, as they call those whom they support, have plenty, there is a physical limit to the process of starvation, and, when the Altruists begin to diminish in numbers, the Aristocrats must also dwindle.

What the outcome will be no man can prophesy,—a relapse into slavery at least, which the Altruists would no doubt enjoy even more than their present arrangements; but there is a chance that their natures may change; they may become Egoists, and no longer take pleasure in giving to those who give nothing in return. Then there will be no Aristocrats, and everybody who is not an Altruist will have a much better time.

JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON.

Two More Victims.

The problem which I recently set Mr. Arthur Kitson and all other opponents of reason in finance proves, as I expected, a Gatling gun. Mr. Kitson fell at the first fire, mortally wounded; and now Mr. William A. Whittick and Mr. George C. Ward, who valiantly advanced to fill the gap, have similarly paid the penalty of their indiscretion. Their letters, printed in this issue, tell the story of this weapon's destructive power.

Let me recall the problem briefly. To those who deny the necessity and even the possibility of a standard of value, I said: Given certain exchange relations between commodities on a certain day; given the value of the monetary unit in each of these commodities on that day; and given certain new exchange relations between the same commodities on a subsequent day,—please calculate for me the value of the monetary unit in each of these commodities at the later date, without permanently relating the unit to a definite quantity of commodity. And I gave, as the first set of exchange relations: 48 ounces of silver=1 ounce of gold=200 ounces of copper, on April 20, 1895; and, as the second set: 48 ounces of silver=3 ounces of gold=300 ounces of copper, on April 20, 1896. As the value of the unit on the earlier date I suggested the value of 1 ounce of gold,—that is, that the unit be assumed to be equal, on April 20, 1895, to 48 ounces of silver, to 1 ounce of gold, and to 200 ounces of copper.

Mr. Kitson, it will be remembered, in his attempt to solve the problem, did indeed, by a perfectly legitimate and accurate process, find certain values for the unit, in silver, gold, and copper, on April 20, 1896; but, to do this, he was obliged to violate the essential condition of the problem,—he was obliged, that is to say, to permanently relate the unit to a definite quantity of commodity. His purpose being to disprove the necessity of a standard of value, he ruined his own case by adopting a standard of value. The standard which he adopted was a multiple commodity standard expressed as follows: 16 ounces of silver+$\frac{1}{3}$ ounce of gold+66$\frac{2}{3}$ ounces of copper. Those who wish to refresh their memory will find his solution in Liberty, No. 315.

That Mr. Kitson had thus placed himself *hors de combat* by adopting a commodity standard Mr. Whittick, up to that time his most intimate comrade in the no-standard crusade, promptly bore testimony in No. 316; and now his testimony is "reluctantly," but emphatically, confirmed by Mr. George C. Ward, another "Arena" financier and bearer of the no-standard flag. "Yes, you downed Kitson easily enough," each of these gentlemen seems to say, "but you won't have any such picnic with me."

Well, let us see. I will begin with Mr. Whittick. With his theoretical considerations, which to me are an absolutely meaningless conglomeration of words impossible for the mind to grasp, I shall not deal, but proceed straightway to examine his proffered solution of the problem. It is exceedingly simple. Using the word dollar, not as an equivalent of a definite quantity of commodity, but simply as a name for the monetary unit, he tells us, without a smile, that, if 48 ounces of silver have, on April 20, 1896, fallen to 50 cents (instead of the dollar which they represented on April 20, 1895), then the value of the dollar will be 6 ounces of gold or 600 ounces of copper. Whittick, my good friend, I learned all that at school, before I was eight years old. Of course, to find the monetary value of any one of these three commodities is to find at the same stroke, since their exchange relations are given, the monetary value of each of the other two. The essential point is to find first the monetary value of some one of them. This result I asked you, not to assume or "suppose," but to calculate from the data given you, which data comprise all the data that would be given in actual commerce. If silver has fallen 50 per cent. between the two

* Since the above was written Ward McAllister has passed away, but that was only in the grosser material sense.

given dates, the fact can be calculated from the exchange relations posited, or else it cannot be calculated at all. What I want you to demonstrate is that the data show silver to have fallen 50 per cent. rather than, say, 75 per cent. or some other figure, and I cannot allow you to beg the question by "supposing" that it has fallen 50 per cent. and supplementing the supposition by working a sum in the rule of three. Not furnishing this demonstration, you have not solved the problem, but have gone to keep Kitson company in his grave.

In passing, it should be noticed that, while Mr. Kitson, in his attempt to solve the problem, finds that silver has appreciated 50 per cent., Mr. Whittick, in his attempt, "supposes" that silver has depreciated 50 per cent.

Picnic No. 3 will be pretty nearly a repetition of picnic No. 2. Mr. Ward, like Mr. Whittick, gets at the value of the unit in gold and in copper by first attributing to it a certain value in silver. For Mr. Ward, however, it is to be said that he does not "suppose" a value of the unit in silver; on the contrary, he asserts this value as a positive fact. Unfortunately he does not inform us on what ground he bases his assertion; and, furthermore, his assertion labors under the disadvantage (or advantage, I don't know which) of differing from Mr. Kitson's calculation on the one hand and from Mr. Whittick's "supposition" on the other. In fact, it lies just half-way between them; for, while Mr. Kitson *calculates* (from an equation that violates the chief condition of the problem) that silver has *risen* 50 per cent., and while Mr. Whittick "*supposes*" that it has *fallen* 50 per cent., Mr. Ward *asserts* that it has not varied at all, but *remains stationary*. Such are the results of "A *Scientific* Solution of the Money Question."

Although, as I have said, Mr. Ward does not tell us why he asserts that silver has not changed in value, his reason for thinking so is perfectly obvious to me. He thinks that, because the figure 48 appears in conjunction with silver in both sets of exchange relations, whereas the figures placed in conjunction with gold and copper differ in the two sets, silver has not, like gold and copper, undergone a change in value. This is a beautiful instance of the superficiality of no-standard reasoning. Any one looking below the surface sees at once that these sets of exchange relations are simply ratios, and that either set could be changed by dividing or multiplying each term of that set by the same number without in the least modifying, except to the outward eye, the data of the problem. By this method I might easily have prevented the appearance of 48, or any other number, in both equations. I took no pains to do this, for it did not occur to me that my opponents could possibly be misled by so utterly immaterial an appearance. It turns out, however, that I over-rated their intelligence (and did not place them on a level with Newton at that).

Suppose, now, that, instead of

48 ounces silver—3 ounces gold—300 ounces copper,

I had chosen the following equation for the expression of the second set of exchange relations:

24 ounces silver—1½ ounces gold—150 ounces copper.

This equation is precisely equivalent to the other, being obtained by a division of each member by 2. But, comparing it with the first set of exchange relations,—*viz.*,

48 ounces silver—1 ounce gold—200 ounces copper,

we see that neither the figure 48, or any other, now appears in both. I ask Mr. Ward to look at these two equations, and tell me which, if any, of these commodities remains stationary.

Again, I might have expressed the second set of exchange relations by this equation:

32 ounces silver—2 ounces gold—200 ounces copper;

or this one:

16 ounces silver—1 ounce gold—100 ounces copper.

All these equations are equivalent. And yet, if I had used the former, probably the reappearance of the figure 200 would have convinced Mr. Ward that silver and gold had changed in value, and that copper had remained stationary; while, if I had used the latter, he would have been equally sure, from the reappearance of the figure 1, that gold was the stationary factor, and that silver and copper had varied. At any rate there would have been precisely the same ground for these conclusions that there now is for his assertion that silver has remained stationary. Of course the truth is that the second set of exchange relations tells us nothing whatever as to whether they result from a decrease in the supply of silver, or from an increase in the supply of gold and copper, or from both, and there is not the slightest warrant for asserting that silver, or any other of these commodities, has remained stationary. Yet it is on such an assertion that Mr. Ward rests his case. But, after all, is it not to be expected that a man who sees so much in the figure 1 as Mr. Ward does should see at least 48 times as much in the figure 48?

I must beg my reader's pardon for devoting so much attention to these puerilities, and especially for printing the long article by Mr. Ward, who has taken advantage of my desire to print any solution of my problem that may be offered, to secure the appearance in these columns of a considerable portion of his silly book. Let me now announce, then, that I shall insist that further contributions in opposition to a material unit of value, with the possible exception of one more article from Mr. Kitson, shall deal exclusively with my problem. That problem solved, there will be no need of further discussion with me, for I shall be a convert. Until it is solved, it remains useless to discuss the question theoretically. C.

Occupancy-and-Use As Bait.

In another column appears the explanation of Mr. Louis F. Post regarding his declarations at Cincinnati in favor of occupancy and use as the only true title to land. Liberty's recent comment on Mr. Post's attitude was sent to him by Mr. George A. Schilling, who has kindly forwarded to me for publication the reply which he received. Mr. Post admits the utterances attributed to him, and then proceeds to emasculate them.

It appears that the phrase occupancy and use is used by Mr. Post simply as an equivalent of the right of possession. In that case it is nonsense to talk about the single tax or any other measure as the best method of reaching the occupancy-and-use title, for in Mr. Post's sense that title already exists. To-day the occupant of land is its *possessor*, in right and in fact. The aim of the occupancy-and-use agitation is not to secure for the occupant a possession which is already his, but an ownership and control which in most cases is not his, but his landlord's,—an ownership and control which shall end when occupancy and use end, but which shall be absolute while occupancy and use continue.

In another part of his letter Mr. Post virtually denies the equivalence of occupancy with possession by declaring that landlords, even those who rent land and buildings in their entirety, are occupants and users. If this be true, then the Astor estate is occupying and using a very large portion of the city of New York. But to assert that the Astors are either occupants or possessors is an utter misuse of language. Besides, if the Astors are occupants and users, and if the single tax will virtually compel the Astors to relinquish their lands, then the single tax, instead of being a means of getting to an occupancy-and-use tenure, will be a means of destroying such tenure. Mr. Post's position bristles at every point with inconsistency and absurdity.

It is so long since I read Mr. George's book that I do not remember whether Mr. Post is right in denying that Mr. George teaches the doctrine of equal ownership of land by all the people. One thing, however, is certain,—that the equal right of *all* people to *every* piece of land is asserted by many of the foremost Single Taxers, some of whom are on the national executive committee of the party. And it is on the strength of this that the single tax is defended. How often we hear Single Taxers deploring the name by which their idea is known! "It is very unfortunate," they will tell you, "that our plan is called a tax. It is not a tax at all. We believe in the utter abolition of taxation. Taxation is robbery,—a taking from the producer of his product. We do not propose to rob; in collecting rent we take only what is ours, for that which comes, not from labor, but from land, belongs, not to the laborer, but to us, the people." If occupancy and use is not a title to land, then this position is sound; on the other hand, if it is a title to land, then the single tax is robbery. Mr. Post cannot escape from this dilemma.

If there must be Single Taxers, I prefer those of the Philadelphia sort, who attack occupancy and use with hammer and tongs, maintaining that it is unscientific and diametrically opposite to their fundamental principles. Relieve me, pray, of opponents like Mr. Post, who, using my own phraseology in a distorted sense, strive to make it appear to the people that their ideas are mine. Let Anarchists be on their guard. Don't bite at phrases. T.

The Creed Essential to the Life.

The comment of Mr. Badcock in another column upon "Egoism's" recent criticism of what it supposed to be my attitude regarding the relation of outsiders to parents who maltreat their children was written before he had seen my rejoinder; and I judge that he must have been surprised, not to say horrified, to find me joining the enemy, bag and baggage. With the reasons which I advanced in support of my position I hope he will deal later, since his

present letter does not meet them.

I shall not undertake to say for "Egoism" whether it does or does not bow to equal liberty as a fetich, regardless of the sufferings of others that may result. But for myself I repeat what I have often said,—that I have no idols. Mr. Badcock has no occasion to discuss with me the propriety of the end at which he aims,—the disappearance of pain. That is my aim also. If I insist on the application of the equal liberty idea to every sphere of life, including the relations of parents to children, and of outsiders to both, it is because I believe that this will result in a minimum of pain. If Mr. Badcock denies it, it is incumbent upon him to show that State control, or a mixture of State and parental control, or some other method of provision for children which he may suggest, will result on the whole in less pain than the plan of exclusively parental control. I am ready to listen carefully to anything that he may have to say on this point. But, if he does not deny it, then I can scarcely think it worth while to make an outcry over what seems to Mr. Badcock the callousness of "Egoism" as long as that journal favors the very measures which Mr. Badcock and I look upon as calculated to most effectively lessen pain.

Mr. Badcock should remember that "G.," in the articles to which I objected some years ago, went counter to equal liberty in asserting the obligations of children to parents, whereas "H.," in denying the obligations of parents to children, is affirming equal liberty. There is a vital difference between the two. Both "H." and "G." may be cruel, or may be kind; but from a public standpoint the natures of either may well be let alone until they prompt them to favor measures that increase suffering.

As long as children are unable to make contracts, I know of no reason why they should not be "put on a par with property," especially if putting them on a par with property tends on the whole to lessen their suffering, and if there is no method of dealing with them that does not put them virtually on a par with property. It certainly is very unfortunate that this is an imperfect world, and that there is no system which will absolutely abolish pain; but will not Mr. Badcock and I have to put up with the best system that we can devise, even though it does fall short of our sympathetic requirements? I know people who are so sympathetic that they would rush to save a stranger in danger of immediate destruction, even though by that very act they would indirectly send a dozen friends to their death. As Herman Kuehn said in these columns, when speaking of Rita in Ibsen's "Little Eyolf," such persons are really moved, not so much by a desire to make all other people happy, as to satisfy their own desire for an activity prompted by their sympathy. It does not follow that, "if our liberty principles . . . . fall short of our requirements, ... they *must* be re-cast." That depends upon whether it is possible to re-cast them so that they will be better suited to our purpose.

T.

When the American editor, who is preternaturally ignorant, comes across a difficult problem, which he cannot dispose of in his usual cavalier fashion, he generally winds up his flatulent remarks about it by commending it to the "careful consideration," or "thoughtful study," or "earnest reflection" of his "intelligent readers." This familiar formula always provokes amusement, but its modesty deserves encouragement. But, when the editor of the "Popular Science Monthly" resorts to it in connection with the subject of legislative corruption and inefficiency, surprise rather than amusement is excited. Mr. Youmans writes that the problem of today is "how to prevent politics from corrupting the character of our citizens and antagonizing the efforts that are made in other spheres for social reform," and he brings his article to a close with nothing more than the suggestion that all right-minded persons ought "to do their duty" toward solving the problem by giving it due attention. Now, such suggestions might be repeated till doomsday without bringing us a step nearer the solution. Those who have no ideas may be pardoned for urging upon each other the importance of seeking them, but those who have ideas ought not to stop at that point. They ought to force upon people's attention the *solution* of the problem instead of the mere fact of the existence of a problem. There are multitudes of people who are very anxious to "purify" politics, but they do not know *how*, and nine times out of ten their well-meant efforts result in intensifying the evils attacked. Mr. Youmans believes that the only way to purify politics is by reducing government to a minimum, and this message he ought to teach and preach at all times. Instead of urging upon people the necessity of doing everything "to abate what is evil and encourage what is good," he ought to be teaching people what good *is*, where evil is to be found, and how it is to be eliminated. He asks the Christian Endeavor people what they are doing to purify politics. Why, bless his soul, of what consequence is that to him when he knows that their ideas are wrong and that their efforts must tend to lower politics rather than to improve it? There are plenty of fine intentions, zeal, and enthusiasm about, Mr. Youmans; intelligence it is which is very scarce, and you are neglecting your opportunities of increasing the stock.

Some New York newspapers are vigorously protesting against a police practice which is outrageous in the extreme, but which is so well established and so dear to the "law and order" folks that it will probably survive the agitation. I allude to the blanket-warrants which the police procure when they desire to raid a suspicious place. The place may be a licensed restaurant or oyster-house, but, if the police suspect that illegal things are committed there, they are authorized to arrest everybody found in the place and hold them pending examinations. Innocent patrons are thus often arrested and held over night in police stations, because the magistrate cannot be troubled to look into their cases until the next morning. Such proceedings are not even legal, yet they are permitted in a city whose police commissioners and judges prohibit the sale of soda water on Sundays in obedience to vague laws strained in the interest of "order."

Some professors and historians have recently been discussing, in magazine articles, the question whether "the people," under popular government, are competent to deal with complex questions of finance and commerce, and the answers have been very flattering and pleasing to the "apotheosized Public" (to use Spencer's expression). They find that, in spite of what they call temporary crazes, such as greenbackism, in the long run the common sense and sturdy honesty of the great mass of voters have led to the triumph of sound ideas and wise policies. What the simple-minded professors and historians overlook in this delightful argument is the necessity of proving that the triumphant ideas and policies *are* sound; we have nothing at present but their own word for it. Surely such a transparent fallacy ought not to deceive anybody. First the professors assume that certain things are right; then they show that these things are on top; finally they shout eureka, and ask us to congratulate ourselves on the evidence of the people's wisdom. It is necessary to remind them that the first assumptions have yet to be justified.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, STEPHEN T. BYINGTON, 108 W. 13th Street, New York City.

I want it borne in mind that, when, after describing a target, I suggest lines of attack. I do not ordinarily mean that you must attack along these lines and no others; and, when I suggest several different lines of attack for the same target, I do not mean that it will probably be best to include them all in one letter. It is desirable that the letters sent to any target should all appear to represent the same school of thought, and commonly that they should all appear to have been suggested by the same occasion; but, if they are so closely alike in detail as to appear to have been copied from a common source, they will lose their good effect. My suggestions are merely intended to show some possible key-notes for your letters; if you can think of equally good key-notes of your own, equally applicable to the targets as described, better use your own.

A comrade, in offering to join the Corps, says that he would prefer to write in German, if possible. This can hardly be arranged for, unless several others will join to form a German section. I should be very glad to have such a section, and I herewith ask as many of Liberty's German-speaking readers as can do so to send in their names for enrollment in a section to write in German. At the same time I must ask them, and other friends, to be especially diligent in sending me targets of German papers and German-speaking persons, for I cannot, from my own reading, supply so many targets for this section as I do for the other sections.

Target, section A.—Bolton Hall, editor "Tax Reform Studies," 111 Broadway, N. Y., asks for attacks, from an Anarchist standpoint, on the prohibitory tax of ten per cent. on State bank notes. Do not, in your letters, call your position by the name of Anarchism.

Section B.—The "Star and Kansan," Independence, Kansas, said a while ago:

Abolish all laws for the collection of debt and all laws making any kind of money a legal tender, and you would see the "intrinsic value" of gold oozing out of it like sweat out of a harvest hand in July.

Ask whether this would not be a better way of breaking down the monopoly power of gold than to shift or extend that monopoly power to silver or paper; whether the abolition of legal tender, if coupled with the abolition of all laws that restrain freedom in the issuing of money, would not be the surest way to prevent any from controlling the money market for objectionable purposes.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

A Personal Explanation.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I very much regret that the unwarrantable intrusion of Mr. Whittick in the discussion over my book necessitates a personal explanation of my relations with him,—an explanation which can scarcely be of much interest to the majority of your readers, but which I feel, in justice to myself, compelled to make. Since his letter contains certain statements regarding my position that are both false and misleading, I must ask your indulgence while I briefly correct them.

All the knowledge and information which Mr. Whittick had to contribute to the "Solution of the Money Question" will be found in his pamphlet entitled: "The Money Question." This is the extent of his capacity as my "teacher." In that pamphlet you will read as follows (page 10): "Gold may be a standard of value, money *never*." This is Mr. Whittick's "original position." The idea of attaching the element of time to the purchasing power of a commodity and using this as a unit--whether a brilliant or ridiculous conception need not here be considered—not only did not occur to him, but, when I read to him the chapter in which I had suggested this idea, he ridiculed it as preposterous. So that, from the standpoint of Liberty, Mr. Whittick's "original position" was wholly sane and orthodox, and, if he has, as he acknowledges, returned to it, he stands side by side with the editor of Liberty. He is right in saying "we were never quite harmonious as to the conception of 'economic value,' for I found many of his ideas on this subject crude indeed.

In the republication of the Money article in "Bombs," Mr. Whittick submitted part of his pamphlet to me, and I advised him to eliminate the sentence "Gold may be a standard of value," which he did.

As to his connection with the production of my book, the story is very brief. I had, at the request of some friends, re-written the main part of a lecture delivered by me before the Single Tax Society in Philadelphia upon this question. This paper had grown from a lecture into a fair-sized pamphlet of several chapters. Wishing the opinion of some radical, and as Mr. Whittick was the only one easy of access, I called upon him and read him my work. He became extravagantly enthusiastic, and declared that some of these ideas were similar to those that had been slowly revolving in his mind in a confused sort of way for years, but he had never been able to express them, or grasp them coherently. He urged me strongly to develop the work, and it was, as I have stated in the preface, largely through his enthusiasm that I expanded what was originally intended merely as a pamphlet into a book of over four hundred pages. As I concluded each chapter, thereafter, I generally read it aloud to him. This led to discussion and frequent opposition, which I found of great assistance, since it served to stimulate thought; and, as a general rule, our discussions ended in his agreeing with me. Towards the conclusion of my task Mr. Whittick said he would like to have his name in some sort of way mentioned in the book. As he had previously—without wish or solicitation on my part—dedicated his "Bombs" to me, he asked me if I would pay him a similar compliment? I replied that I should certainly mention his name, and give him all the credit to which he was entitled. Before the publication of the book I read him the preface just as it now appears, especially the part acknowledging his aid and which you quote, and he stated he considered it a most generous notice,—more, in fact, than he deserved. He has mentioned this to several others, who have repeated his remarks to me.

After having, as I know for a fact, and as he has several times acknowledged, carefully read and re-read and studied my book, he has for several months past been advertising and selling it. He has distributed a considerable number of copies, and quoted and defended it from the platform. In view of all this, his letter of June 16 is simply amazing in its brazen effrontery. If he were as instrumental in its production as he intimates, why was it necessary for him to "carefully read Mr. Kitson's book" and to refer to it as such?

The aid Mr. Whittick furnished me, and for which I have given him ample and hearty thanks, was assisting me in correcting the proof and revising certain sentences, and cutting out certain parts in which I had indulged in repetition. As to any original ideas, I know of none outside of the pamphlet to which I refer.

The evident thirst for notoriety which has prompted Mr. Whittick to seek to claim credit in one breath for a work which he condemns in the next is too contemptible to need further notice.

I sincerely regret that he has compelled me to make this unpleasant explanation.

I desire to say, in conclusion, that, since this dispute between Mr. Whittick and me can be of no interest to the readers of Liberty, and as I have promised not to prolong this discussion, I shall take no notice of any further remarks that may be made in Liberty upon this subject. It is solely on account of Mr. Whittick's name appearing in my book that I have taken the trouble to offer this explanation.

Yours truly,

ARTHUR KITSON.

PHILADELPHIA, JULY 2, 1895.

P. S.—Do not deceive yourself, Mr. Editor, as to my being almost a deserted man. I can well afford to exchange a notoriety-hunter for such men as Dr. Ross, John F. Kelly, Professor Keasbey, and similar well-known scientists, the former of whom wrote: "I accept your work from pages 108 to 302." Scarcely a week elapses without my receiving similar testimonials, which now number into the hundreds.

Mr. Post Explains.

My dear Mr. Schilling:

Responding to your request for an explanation regarding a clipping you hand me from Liberty, I am glad of an opportunity to define my position in the matter.

I find the clipping to contain a correspondent's report that in a lecture given in Cincinnati last May I stated that occupancy and use was really the only true title to land; and that, after the lecture, my attention being called to the statement, I explained that my advocacy of the single tax was as the best method of reaching the occupancy-and use title. I note Mr. Tucker's comment upon the report to the effect that, if I was not misunderstood, my position involves the rejection of the single-tax theory, and pledges me to the single tax only as a measure of expediency and as a stepping-stone. Also the implication in his comment that Mr. George, and prominent single-tax champions generally, deny the theory that land belongs to the occupant and user, and hold that it belongs equally to all the people.

I did assert in that lecture, and I have for years frequently asserted, in substance or in terms, that occupancy and use is the only true title to land. Exactly what I said to Mr. Tucker's correspondent after the lecture I cannot positively recall, though the incident is perfectly fresh in my memory. In the confusions of many conversations going on at the time I may have conveyed the impression reported by the correspondent. Since he says so, I have no doubt of it. But I did not mean to imply that I advocate the single tax as a stepping stone in the sense of a temporary expedient. What I meant was this,—that I advocate the single tax as the only way of obtaining and maintaining the title of occupancy and use. Under the single tax, so it seems to me, there would be no motive for appropriating land to any important extent without occupying and using it. And I can conceive of no other way in which the abstract principle of occupancy and use can be brought into practical operation. I am aware of the point that, under the single tax, buildings would often be occupied by rent-paying tenants. But, when one man erects a building which another rents of him, in whole or in part, it seems to me that in any fair construction of the occupancy-and-use theory they are partners, in both the occupancy and the use of the land upon which that building stands.

In what I believe and have said about occupancy and use I do not regard myself as antagonizing Mr. George. I have always understood him to believe that that is the only true title, though I do not remember ever hearing him put it into that phrase. His habit is to distinguish between ownership and possession, opposing the one and advocating the other. But that is the same thing. Any title that gives ownership of land in the same sense as ownership of what we produce is not an occupancy-and-use title. It is an absolute title. Possession, on the other hand, under circumstances which make it so unprofitable without use that it would be relinquished (and the single tax would have that effect), is clearly a title by occupancy and use. Mr. George has never taught the doctrine of equal ownership of land by all the people. He may at times have used such expressions as "nationalization of land," "townshipization of land," etc., as many of us have done, from which the idea of equal ownership might be inferred by one unfamiliar with "Progress and Poverty"; but, when these words were considered with their context, no one would suppose he used them in the sense of common *ownership* or any other kind of ownership.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS F. POST.

NEW YORK, JULY 3, 1895.

Mr. Whittick Tries It.

To the Editor of Liberty:

The problem you set Mr. Kitson of positing a unit of value not related to some commodity standard can easily be solved.

Your prior problem (No. 311) posits a material unit of value on April 20, 1895, and utterly rejects it a year later, falling back upon *quantity relations* instead of giving *price relations*,—the functioning of the unit in the meantime, while the changes in values were taking place, being disregarded; and yet you ask your opponents to follow this false unit through the intricacies of the unknown.

I wil now try to demonstrate an *invariable* abstract unit of abstract value, using your own figures in the process.

On April 20, 1895, the values of 48 ounces of silver, 1 ounce of gold, and 200 ounces of copper are equal. The equivalents of these values *might be* (not necessarily) ascertained in all other commodities, and it may be implied that this is done, and that an equivalent value line runs through all exchangeable wealth.

We need an *unchangeable value*, by which to note *changeable values*. No commodity possesses this attribute of unfluctuating value.

We will, therefore, take a certain value at a certain time, and divorce it from any commodity, so that the influences of supply and demand shall not affect our selected fixed value. We will call this fixed value a unit of value, and use it as a standard and measure of *all values*. We will call the unit *a dollar*.

If this unit correctly indicates the slightest change in values, it is a self-demonstrated invariable unit and measure of value.

To so function, it must be used continuously, and changes in value *must be expressed in prices, not in quantities*.

Therefore, the changes mentioned as occurring from April 20, 1895, to April 20, 1896, expressed in quantities, cannot be followed by the rejected or unused unit, adopted April 20, 1895.

We have the alternative of a supposition by which to use our unit, or the creation of a new unit on the basis of values April 20, 1896. (The latter, a very simple operation.)

Let us use the former,—a supposition.

Suppose that the unit had been continuously used, and that under supply and demand the value of 48 ounces of silver had declined from one dollar to fifty cents.

Then 3 ounces of gold and 300 ounces of copper being the same in value as 48 ounces of silver, each quantity is worth 50 cents on April 20, 1896.

The *pricometer* would read as follows on the two dates mentioned:

April 20, 1895.

Silver.	Gold.	Copper.
48 oz.	1 oz.	200 oz.
Values one dollar each.		

April 20, 1896.

Silver.	Gold.	Copper.
48 oz.	1 oz.	200 oz.
Values 50 cents.	16⅔ cents.	33⅓ cents.

Or, with the quantities raised to the dollar mark:

April 20, 1896.

Silver.	Gold.	Copper.
96 oz.	6 oz.	600 oz.
Values one dollar each.		

Values have thus freely moved under the law of supply and demand, but the unit and measure of such values is unchanged.

The unit is totally divorced from commodity influences, as a necessity of its functional uses, and is un-

related to any commodity-standard. (The expression *commodity-standard* is absolutely meaningless, because no commodity can function as a standard for another and totally dissimilar commodity.)

Nothing but *values*, expressed numerically, can be a common ground upon which a value-standard may function.

With this *ideal unit of ideal values*, it will be impossible for abnormal influences to control values; and the insidious and inherent rascality of a monopolized, unscientific commodity unit (impossible except as an element of evil) would be destroyed.

WM. A. WHITTICK.

Another Solution.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Upon a perusal of the issues of Liberty of April 20 and June 15, I am forced to reluctantly concede that you and Mr. Hugo Bilgram have decidedly the best of the argument with Mr. Arthur Kitson in relation to the so-called "standard of value." This is not to say, however, that either you or Mr. Bilgram have advanced arguments by which the theory "of an invariable monetary unit is riddled completely"; your victory is explained by the fact that Mr. Kitson himself was endeavoring to maintain the practicability of establishing a *commodity* monetary unit that should be invariable. Such a unit is an impossible absurdity, as you well demonstrate.

But there is a monetary unit—the only true one, if you please—which is ever immutable, invariable, and just, although it is what you, I presume, call "a valueless abstraction." It is the figure 1, of which, with its multiples and decimals, all money is but the material embodiment and representative. Money is but *materialized counters*. None but those who doubt and distrust the stability of the issuing government attach the idea of redemption to money.

Money is a legalized system of comparing and differentiating values, by and through the medium of materialized counters. Money coins, or bills, are the material embodiments of the ideal, abstract, invariable, and immutable natural unit of account—the figure 1—with its decimals and multiples. Money has, or should have, no "actual value," its value being legal and arbitrary, consisting partly of the power to count and differentiate (real) values, but chiefly in the promise of the people, severally and collectively, to receive it in settlement of all debts, public and private; such promise being crystallized into law by legal-tender acts. Articles or commodities, of real or actual value, are differentiated in value, not by comparison with the value, but with the numeral denomination of money. A certain range, or schedule, of articles are all, each of them worth as much as the other,—*i. e.*, each of equal value. These articles or commodities are each worth a unit, or basis value—the figure 1—called by us one dollar—in England, one pound—in France, one franc—in India, one rupee. The multiples of such unit represent the number of units, or basis values, an article is worth; and thus money is but a measure of comparison by which we differentiate the comparative value of several commodities, in which, and not in the money, the value inheres. It is only in settling international (foreign) balances that the value of the metal is taken cognizance of, and then by weight, at its commercial value.

The phrase "money of ultimate redemption" is the utterance of financial lunacy. Money, in its simplest analysis, is a certificate that the holder thereof has performed certain services for, or parted with certain commodities to, the community, severally and collectively, and that the community, severally and collectively, owes him a like value in return. Each time such money changes hands it has been redeemed by the community, severally. When it is received by the community, through its national, State, and county governments, in payment of taxes, it has been redeemed by the community, collectively. The total volume of money in circulation is annually redeemed twice, or more than twice, by being received for taxes. Very few of our citizens know, and none (except bankers) care, how much metal constitutes a standard unit. They simply use the dollar as a counter or numerator, and, comparing one with the other, say a horse is worth 100 units, and a cow 25 units, which enables a man who wishes to turn a horse into four cows to sell the horse for counters to a man who wants a horse, but has no cows, and then give the counters for four cows to a man who has them, but does not want a horse. Neither of them would want gold or silver, except to exchange for a horse or cows.

Might not all interests be subserved and all desired ends accomplished by the issue of an absolute, inconvertible paper dollar, whose value shall be, as the supreme court has expressed it, "an ideal thing"?

Such a dollar should not wear the badge of servitude to the money power, "On demand, the United States promises to pay," but rather should the inscription read: "We, the people of the United States, severally and collectively promise to receive this bill, at its denominational value, in payment of all debts, public and private."

But, you will doubtless say, all of this does not solve the problem I submitted to Mr. Kitson in Liberty of April 20. True; but your problem is easily answered from this, the true basis, of a scientific monetary unit of "*account*," (not "*value*.")

You say:

> Suppose that today, April 20, 1895, Mr. Kitson's monetary system goes into operation. Suppose, further, that, in his preliminary tabulation of the exchange relations of commodities as existing on April 20, he finds that 48 ounces of silver=1 ounce of gold=200 ounces of copper; and that he takes 1 ounce of gold, at its valuation of April 20, as his invariable unit. A year elapses. On April 20, 1896, the exchange relations of silver, gold, and copper, in consequence of variations in the supply and demand of these commodities, are found, we will suppose, to be as follows: 48 ounces of silver=3 ounces of gold=300 ounces of copper. Now let us leave copper out of consideration for a moment. If on April 20, 1895, when 48 ounces of silver were worth 1 ounce of gold, 1 ounce of gold was worth 1 unit, then on April 20, 1896, when 48 ounces of silver are worth 3 ounces of gold, 1 ounce of gold is worth ⅓ of a unit. So far, so good.
>
> Now let us pause to note, first, that the changes in the exchange relations of silver, gold, and copper "are caused by variations in the supply and demand of these commodities." Second: you say Mr. Kitson takes 1 ounce of gold as his "invariable unit." If Mr. Kitson does this, he is guilty of an absurdity to commence with.
>
> But let us take the figure 1 as the unit of account, or abstract, ideal "dollar." Let us assume that the 1 ounce of gold was worth on April 20, 1895, twenty units, or dollars. Then silver was worth 41¼ cents an ounce, while copper was worth 10 cents an ounce, all counted, differentiated, and represented in full legal tender, "absolute," or inconvertible paper money.
>
> A year elapses. Changes have taken place in the relative exchange values of these commodities, as compared with each other, and these changes are to be expressed in monetary terms through the medium of our materialized counters, or money. Under this system gold becomes subject to the same laws of supply and demand governing other commodities. With our ideal money we can express and designate what gold is "worth."
>
> We compare, differentiate, and express all values in terms of money denominations. Thus we say an article is "worth" one, ten, or fifty dollars, as the case may be. Not so, however, with the quantity of metal coined into a gold dollar. We do not say of it that it shall be worth $1, but that it shall *be* $1, and this privilege of being converted into a dollar we confer upon every 25.8 grains of standard gold not demanded for use in the arts; with the result that no gold can be obtained for use in the arts for less value, so that millions of gold dollars are annually melted and used in arts. Having thus not given 25.8 grains of standard gold the value of $1, but constituted it the dollar itself, we proceed to measure the value of all other commodities, as gauged by the law of supply and demand, with the gold dollar thus artificially created by the fiat of law.
>
> The grotesque absurdity of the metallic fallacy can best be recognized in an attempt to measure the value of a commodity in its own terms, or by itself. Under our coinage laws we declare by fiat of law that 25.8 grains of standard gold shall *be* one dollar, and then gravely assert that 25.8 grains of gold are *worth* one dollar. This is simply equivalent to saying that a dollar is worth a dollar.
>
> But to return to our problem. On April 20, 1896, you suppose the exchange relations of the three commodities in question to be 48 ounces of silver=3 ounces of gold=300 ounces of copper. Very good. We now take as the basis of computation the stationary value, which in this case is silver, gold and copper having both become relatively cheaper, or less valuable. So, then, expressed in terms of ideal currency, silver remains worth 41¼ cents an ounce, while gold is worth only $6.66⅔ an ounce and copper but 6⅔ cents an ounce.
>
> But bear in mind that these values, so expressed, are *not* the values of money, but the relative values of commodities in exchange with each other.
>
> Thus it is at once seen that the sale of the stated quantity of either one of these metals is only one-half of a transaction, which is not completed until the money obtained for the one metal is exchanged for the other metal.
>
> We never can tell just what gold and silver are really worth until we cease to use them as money and allow their relative values, as compared to that of other commodities, to be differentiated and expressed in terms of abstract and ideal monetary units, or value denominators. The value is in the commodities exchanged, and not in the money through and by the medium of which they are exchanged.
>
> You sum up in these words:
>
> That is to say, starting with the same data and following two parallel and irrefutable lines of argument, we arrive at contradictory conclusions. And, by taking other commodities into account and applying the same argument in each case, it could be shown that, with Mr. Kitson's "invariable" unit, an ounce of gold at any given moment would have a thousand and one different values, all expressed in terms of the same unit or denominator.

In this conclusion you are correct, and the only way this result is avoided under the operation of the "intrinsic value," "specie basis," metallic money delusion is by giving and affixing to gold, by fiat of law, an arbitrary and a fictitious value. The term "worth" cannot apply to money, but is solely applicable to commodities. "Price" is the relative exchange values of commodities, expressed in figures, by a ratio of comparison based upon the invariable unit of account, the figure 1.

Money must be entirely divorced from all ideas of commodity value and be recognized as materialized counters.

Yours for the right,

GEO. C. WARD.

The Life More Than the Creed.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Not every one who has been advanced beyond the barbaric Fijian type, but certainly all who have reached that highly nervous and susceptible stage of development wherein a requirement of existence—as an essential factor to happiness—is the elimination from the environment of, at least, all the grosser discords that injure the sympathetic and æsthetic feelings, could not but regard some of the editorials that appear in the paper called "Egoism" (published in California) with disgust. To show the low plane of egoistic satisfaction that suffices for the wants of the editors of the said paper, I beg to point to an article over the signature "H." in the last issue (dated June 3) that has reached me,—an article that is very similar to previous articles by "G.," which have already been sat upon by you. "H." lays down the law that citizens must allow parents to "beat their children to all but death or permanent disablement," or to otherwise maltreat them as they think fit, on the ground that parents, as producers of their children, are absolute rightful owners and disposers of them as of all their other products. Children are put on a par with property.

To justify this attitude "H." puts forward the principles of *liberty* and *products to the producer*, as he sees them, bowing to the word, under a supposed logical necessity, as to a fetich, without being influenced at all by the sufferings of others. Now, while I am not now concerned to discuss the logical interpretation and application of the principles mentioned, I *am* concerned about the attainment of the end which these principles are intended to subserve. My sympathies, my well-being, requiring that the infliction of pain shall cease (with due allowance only for the necessities of existence, and acknowledgment of the limitation of my powers to obtain all I want), I am delighted whenever I find principles formulated, as guides to conduct, which promise a lessening of pain and an increase of pleasure. But, clearly, if any of the principles I hold to for that end can be turned and twisted about as to justify aggressions or to give the protection of law to those who tor-

ture children or the lower animals,—forcibly preventing the sympathetic from shielding the latter from their parents, guardians, or so-called producers,—then such principles are a menace to those who seek harmony, and absolutely useless for the purpose for which they were originally invoked.

As it is suffering that is the prime mover for all ameliorating libertarian propaganda, it is seen that *sentiency* alone places any organism above all property regulations. So long as child or domestic animal is unable to get the help of the sympathetic against the cruelty of those who have power over it, there is liberating work still to be done; and, if our liberty principles cannot be extended so as to shield the child and animal, then they fall short of our requirements—the requirements of the sympathetic—and must be re-cast.

I don't, for one moment, think Liberty's propaganda is insufficient for its purpose, but it is worth remembering that the life is more than the creed.

Yours ever,

JOHN BADCOCK, JR.,

ST. BRELADES, LEYTON, ENGLAND, JUNE 21, 1895.

The Newspaper Anarchist.

[The Cincinnatian.]

Demon snorting flame and panic,
Lo! an Anarch out of jail,
Goring with his horns Satanic,
Stabbing with his spear-head tail.

On his hoofs of Hell a-springing,
Mangling corpses, on he comes;
And his eyes are daggers slinging,
While his hands are throwing bombs.

Oh! the massacre appalling!
Oh! the monster sparing none!
Off the big police are crawling;
Off the brave militia run.

Bowels, bones, and brains he scatters,
On a-prancing o'er the slain,
Blowing bodies into tatters,
Slashing at the shrieks of pain.

Lofty buildings down he dashes,
Madly whooping vengeance dire.
Flame o'er cities proud he flashes,
And cavorts amid the fire.

Blood in pounds upon him sticketh;
Blood by hogsheads marks his trail;
And 'tis blood the Anarch licketh
From his awful, awful tail.

Oh! the fiend! the fiend of Labor,
Satan-armed, and Satan-shod,
Caring naught for club or sabre
Brandished by the sons of God!

See him waving, grim and gory,
Labor's red in Freedom's name!
Shall he longer daunt our glory?
Mock fore'er with blood and flame?

Men of money, dare ye falter?
Dollars now for succor cry.
Let us Freedom sternly halter!
Let us lead her out to die!

Fairhelp.

A RARE OPPORTUNITY.

Bound Volumes of Liberty, Almost New.

I have for disposal one volume each of vols. III and IV, and will deliver them to the person offering the largest amount therefor. Figures will be received until September 1, 1895.

WM. TRINKAUS, 522 Rialto Building, Chicago, Ill.

FRANCIS NOREEN

A PRACTICAL TAILOR CATERING TO THE FASTIDIOVS AND ECCENTRIC AT FORTY-ONE ESSEX STREET BOSTON, MASSACHVSETTS

THE BALLOT.

BY WILLIAM WALSTEIN GORDAK.

A short poem illustrating the absurdity of majority rule. Printed as a leaflet, with an effective advertisement of Liberty on the back. Excellent for propagandism.

Ten Cents Per Hundred Copies.

Mailed, post-paid, by

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY.

BY

STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS.

A well-printed book of 165 large pages, consisting of two essays bearing the following titles respectively: "The True Constitution of Government in the Sovereignty of the Individual as the Final Development of Protestantism, Democracy, and Socialism"; "Cost the Limit of Price: A Scientific Measure of Honesty in Trade as One of the Fundamental Principles in the Solution of the Social Problem."

This work is an elaborate exposition of the teachings of Josiah Warren by one of his foremost disciples.

PRICE IN CLOTH, $1.00; IN PAPER, 50 CENTS.

PREMIUM OFFER.

Any person purchasing of the undersigned a cloth-bound copy of "The Science of Society" will also receive, free of charge, one copy of "The Review of the Anarchist Case," by Gen. M. M. Trumbull, and of "The Reasons for Pardoning Schwab, *et al.*," by Gov. John P. Altgeld.

Any person purchasing a paper-bound copy will also receive, free of charge, one copy of Tolstoi's "Church and State."

Mailed, post-paid, by

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

INSTEAD OF A BOOK:

BY A MAN TOO BUSY TO WRITE ONE.

A FRAGMENTARY EXPOSITION OF

PHILOSOPHICAL ANARCHISM.

Culled from the Writings of

BENJ. R. TUCKER,

EDITOR OF LIBERTY.

With a Full-Page Half-Tone Portrait of the Author.

A large, well-printed, and excessively cheap volume of 324 pages, consisting of articles selected from Liberty and classified under the following headings: (1) State Socialism and Anarchism: How Far They Agree, and Wherein They Differ; (2) The Individual, Society, and the State; (3) Money and Interest; (4) Land and Rent; (5) Socialism; (6) Communism; (7) Methods; (8) Miscellaneous. The whole elaborately indexed.

Price, Fifty Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, NEW YORK CITY.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

THE QUINTESSENCE OF IBSENISM. By G. Bernard Shaw. Pronounced by the London *Saturday Review* a "most diverting book," and by the author "the most complete assertion of the validity of the human will as against all laws, institutions, *isms*, and the like, now procurable for a quarter." Ibsen's works have been read very widely in America, and there have been almost as many interpretations as readers. This conflict of opinion will cause the liveliest curiosity to know what view is taken by Mr. Bernard Shaw, who is not only one of the keenest students of Ibsen, but one of the wittiest writers in England. He takes up the plays *seriatim*, subjects each to searching analysis, and extracts the quintessence of the whole. Nearly 200 pages. Price, paper, 25 cents.

CAPTAIN ROLAND'S PURSE: How It is Filled and How Emptied. By John Ruskin. The first of a projected series of Labor Tracts. Supplied at 37 cents per hundred.

THE STORY OF AN AFRICAN FARM. By Olive Schreiner. A romance, not of adventure, but of the intellectual life and growth of young English and German people living among the Boers and Kaffirs; picturing the mental struggles through which they passed in their evolution from orthodoxy to rationalism; and representing advanced ideas on religious and social questions. A work of remarkable power, beauty, and originality. 375 pages. Price, cloth, 60 cents; paper, 25 cents.

HEROES OF THE REVOLUTION OF '71. A souvenir picture of the Paris Commune, presenting Fifty-One Portraits of the men whose names are most prominently connected with that great uprising of the people, and adorned with mottoes from Danton, Blanqui, Pyat, Proudhon, J. Wm. Lloyd, Tridon, and August Spies. Of all the Commune souvenirs that have ever been issued this picture stands easily first. It is executed by the phototype process from a very rare collection of photographs, measures 15 inches by 24, and is printed on heavy paper for framing. Over 50 portraits for 25 cents.

THE WIND AND THE WHIRLWIND. By Wilfred Scawen Blunt. A poem worthy of a place in every man's library, and especially interesting to all victims of British tyranny and misrule. A red-line edition, printed beautifully, in large type, on fine paper, and bound in parchment covers. Elegant and cheap. 32 pages. Price, 25 cents.

ANARCHISTS' MARCH. Tune: Björneborgarnes Marsch (Finnish War Song). Words by J. Wm. Lloyd. Price, 10 cents.

BOMBS: The Poetry and Philosophy of Anarchy. By William A. Whittick. 187 pages. Price, cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents.

SO THE RAILWAY KINGS ITCH FOR AN EMPIRE, DO THEY? By a "Red-Hot Striker," of Scranton, Pa. A reply to an article by William M. Grosvenor in the *International Review*. Price, 10 cents: per hundred, $4.00.

LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE, and the Sovereignty of the Individual. A discussion between Henry James, Horace Greeley, and Stephen Pearl Andrews. Including the final replies of Mr. Andrews, rejected by the New York *Tribune*, and a subsequent discussion, occurring twenty years later, between Mr. James and Mr. Andrews. 121 pages. Price, 35 cents.

MY UNCLE BENJAMIN. A humorous, satirical, and philosophical novel. By Claude Tillier. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. With a sketch of the author's life and works by Ludwig Pfau. This work, though it has enjoyed the honor of three translations into German, has never before been translated into English. It is one of the most delightfully witty works ever written. Almost every sentence excites a laugh. It is thoroughly realistic, but not at all repulsive. Its satirical treatment of humanity's foibles and its jovial but profound philosophy have won its author the title of "the modern Rabelais." My Uncle Benjamin riddles with the shafts of his good-natured ridicule the shams of theology, law, medicine, commerce, war, marriage, and society generally. 312 pages. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

ANARCHISM: ITS AIMS AND METHODS. An address delivered at the first public meeting of the Boston Anarchists' Club, and adopted by that organization as its authorized exposition of its principles. With an appendix giving the Constitution of the Anarchists' Club and explanatory notes regarding it. By Victor Yarros. 30 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 25 copies, $1.00; 100 copies, $3.00.

GOD AND THE STATE. "One of the most eloquent pleas for liberty ever written. Paine's 'Age of Reason' and 'Rights of Man' consolidated and improved. It stirs the pulse like a trumpet call." By Michael Bakounine. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. 52 pages. Price, 15 cents.

MUTUAL BANKING: Showing the radical deficiency of the existing circulating medium, and how interest on money can be abolished. By William B. Greene. Price, 25 cents.

FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: Their Nature, Essence, and Maintenance. An abridgment and rearrangement of Lysander Spooner's "Trial by Jury." Edited by Victor Yarros. 47 pages. Price, 25 cents.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? Or, an Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government. By P. J. Proudhon. Prefaced by a Sketch of Proudhon's Life and Works. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. A systematic, thorough, and concise discussion of the institution of property,—its basis, its history, its present status, and its destiny,—together with a detailed and startling *expose* of the crimes which it commits, and the evils which it engenders. 500 pages octavo. Price, cloth, $2.00; paper, $1.20.

SYSTEM OF ECONOMICAL CONTRADICTIONS: Or, the Philosophy of Misery. By P. J. Proudhon. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. This work constitutes the fourth volume of the Complete Works, and is published in a style uniform with that of "What Is Property?" It discusses, in a style as novel as profound, the problems of Value, Division of Labor, Machinery, Competition, Monopoly, Taxation, and Providence, showing that economic progress is achieved by the appearance of a succession of economic forces, each of which counteracts the evils developed by its predecessor, and then, by developing evils of its own, necessitates its successor, the process to continue until a final force, corrective of the whole, shall establish a stable economic equilibrium. 469 pages octavo, in the highest style of the typographic art. Price, cloth, $2.00.

A POLITICIAN IN SIGHT OF HAVEN: Being a Protest Against Government of Man by Man. By Auberon Herbert. Price, 10 cents.

INVOLUNTARY IDLENESS. An exposition of the causes of the discrepancy existing between the supply of and the demand for labor and its products. By Hugo Bilgram. 119 pages. Price, cloth, 50 cents.

A LETTER TO GROVER CLEVELAND ON HIS False Inaugural Address, the Usurpations and Crimes of Lawmakers and Judges, and the Consequent Poverty, Ignorance, and Servitude of the People. 1886. By Lysander Spooner. 110 pages. Price, 35 cents.

THE ANARCHISTS: A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century. A poet's prose contribution to the literature of philosophic and egoistic Anarchism. The author traces his own mental development in London amid the exciting events of 1887,—the manifestations of the unemployed, the rioting at Trafalgar Square, and the executions at Chicago. The antagonism between Communism and Anarchism sharply brought out. By John Henry Mackay. Translated from the German by George Schumm. 315 pages, with portrait of the author. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

TAXATION OR FREE TRADE? A Criticism upon Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade?" By John F. Kelly. 16 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 100 copies, $3.00.

SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC, MUTUALISTIC, and Financial Fragments. By W. B. Greene. Price, $1.25.

CO-OPERATION: ITS LAWS AND PRINCIPLES. An essay showing Liberty and Equity as the only conditions of true co-operation, and exposing the violations of these conditions by Rent, Interest, Profit, and Majority Rule. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Herbert Spencer. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

PROHIBITION. An essay on the relation of government to temperance, showing that prohibition cannot prohibit, and would be unnecessary if it could. By C. T. Fowler. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE REORGANIZATION OF BUSINESS. An essay showing how the principles of co-operation may be realized in the Store, the Bank, and the Factory. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CORPORATIONS. An essay showing how the monopoly of railroads, telegraphs, etc., may be abolished without the intervention of the State. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Wendell Phillips. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CO-OPERATIVE HOMES. An essay showing how the kitchen may be abolished and the independence of woman secured by severing the State from the Home, thereby introducing the voluntary principle into the Family and all its relationships. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Louise Michel. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

LAND TENURE. An essay showing the governmental basis of land monopoly, the futility of governmental remedies, and a natural and peaceful way of starving out the landlords. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Robert Owen. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LAWS of Congress Prohibiting Private Mails. 1844. By Lysander Spooner. 24 pages. Price, 10 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. II. 1867. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 15 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. VI. Showing that the constitution is of no authority. 1870. By Lysander Spooner. 59 pages. Price, 25 cents.

ILLEGALITY OF THE TRIAL OF JOHN W. WEBSTER. Containing the substance of the author's larger work, "Trial by Jury," now out of print. 1850. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 10 cents

NATURAL LAW: Or, the Science of Justice. A treatise on natural law, natural justice, natural rights, natural liberty, and natural society; showing that all legislation whatsoever is an absurdity, a usurpation, and a crime. Part First, 1882. By Lysander Spooner. 31 pages. Price, 10 cents.

A LETTER TO THOMAS F. BAYARD. Challenging his right—and that of all the other so-called senators and representatives in Congress—to exercise any legislative power whatever over the people of the United States. By Lysander Spooner. Price, 3 cents.